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Reviewer's report:

Title: Structural Racism in Precision Medicine: all patients are equal but some patients are more equal than others

I want to appreciate the efforts of authors for a well written debate on the impact of structural racism on precision medicine. I personally feel that it is one of the prominent topic of discussion among the researchers, practitioners and patients alike.

The manuscript debate, in detail about all the reasons of bias in the process of precision medicine. It recognises three nodes where structural racism has impact on the process of precision medicine. I also appreciate the efforts of authors to bring in the topic of Artificial Intelligence and how machine learning can be influenced by structural racism.

The manuscript "identifies" three nodes where structural racism can impact. I feel that these nodes pre-exist in the design (definition) of precision medicine and authors rightly argue with evidence how structural racism interfere at these nodes.

However, I have some observations and suggestions.
1. I want to point out that the whole argument is around "biased data". At First Node authors argue on production of biased data due to subjective interpretation. Second Node they discuss on how collection and integration of this biased data (at first node) leads to faulty interpretation. Third Node they argue that risk of racial discrimination is due to discriminatory efforts of feeding biased data into healthcare framework. Hence my argument is that the biased data recognised by authors at first node has a cascading effect at second and third node if not taken care of. Rather than looking into these nodes independently we can have a process flow (data production, integration and feeding into framework) approach for precision medicine.
2. All the actions suggested by the authors are very well identified and justified. Considering the above argument by me it is prudent to include action points (solutions) in same process flow approach.
3. These action points can be indicated in the figure 1 also.
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